

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 21, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 21, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wu* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123472) in view of *Chen* (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,598). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that *Wu* fails to qualify as prior art capable of rendering the claim obvious under § 103. Specifically, *Wu* published on July 1, 2004 which is after both the provisional and non-provisional filing dates (August 1, 2003 and September 24, 2003, respectively) of the present application, thereby precluding *Wu* from qualifying as prior art under subsections (a) or (b) of § 102. Further, *Wu* fails to qualify as prior art under § 102(e) since *Wu* was filed in the United States on November 12, 2003, which is after the invention by the Applicants. Therefore, *Wu* in view of *Chen* cannot render claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen*. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of *Claxton* (U.S. Patent No. 5,394,616). Further, claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of *Tursi* (U.S. Patent No. 4,924,597). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to include the limitation of previous claim 19, which depended from claim 14 and was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 14 and claims 20 and 21 dependent thereon are

patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Claims 35 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wu* in view of *Gingras* (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,670). Additionally, claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wu* and *Gingras* in view of *Chen*. In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As stated above regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicants submit that *Wu* fails to qualify as prior art capable of rendering the claims obvious under § 103. Therefore, *Wu* in view of *Chen* and/or *Gingras* fails to render claims 35-37 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***


Claims 2, 4-10, 12-13, 19, 33-34, 38 and 40 are indicated as allowed. Applicants acknowledge allowance of these claims.

### ***Conclusion***

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William B. Patterson  
Registration No. 34,102  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants